

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated April 9, 2008. Claims 1-36 were pending. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, and 22 are amended to further clarify the invention, not for reasons of patentability. Claims 7, 8, 17, 18, and 31-36 are canceled. No claims are added. Claims 1-30 remain pending.

In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 11, and 21. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. However, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by He (US 2004/0,118,916). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Filing Date: September 10, 2003

Reference

He discloses using an imaging system to verify RFID reads. As a Reader obtains an ID from an RFID tag, it compares an image of what it is reading to images associated with that RFID tag to verify that it is obtaining a reading from the correct item. It is noted that He does not disclose determining more than one item in an image.

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:

...

identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the identity of the first object. (Emphasis added).

He discloses verifying an RFID reader is reading the correct object by comparing an image of the item to a library of images corresponding to the RFID code read. He does not disclose using one object in the image of the item to narrow the library of potential matches to identify another object in the image.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by He since He does not show the identical invention in complete detail as is contained in the claim. (See MPEP 2131). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10 are dependent from claim 1, and are allowable at least because of that dependency.

Additionally, regarding Claim 3, He does not disclose having an identifier of a delegate object received from another object. This is described at least on page 6, lines 17-24 of the instant application. In one example provided in the specification, a desktop computer provides

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Filing Date: September 10, 2003

data concerning attached peripherals including a keyboard, a mouse, and a printer. Claim 3 is allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 11 shares a similar limitation to that argued above for Claim 1, "identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the identity of the first object" and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12–20 are dependent from claim 11, and are allowable at least because of that dependency.

Claim 21 as amended recites:

an identifying module configured to **identify a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the identity of the first object.**
(Emphasis added).

Again, as described above in the arguments for Claim 1, He does not disclose using one object in the image of the item to narrow the library of potential matches to identify another object in the image.

Accordingly, Claim 21 is not anticipated by He since He does not show the identical invention in complete detail as is contained in the claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22–30 are dependent from claim 21, and are allowable at least because of that dependency.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Filing Date: September 10, 2003

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Filing Date: September 10, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 30, 2008

By: /James Haugen, Reg. # 60056/

James Haugen, Reg. No.: 60,056
Agent for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 703-6636
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 30, 2008

/Noemi Tovar/

Date

Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Filing Date: September 10, 2003